

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F030207 People v. Zarate, et al.

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the calendar date heretofore set is vacated and the case is submitted for decision.

F033784 People v. Herrold

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

F030859 Flanagan, Mason, Robbins & Gnass, et al. v. Brazelton
F030512 Flanagan, Mason, Robbins & Gnass, et al. v. Superior Court, Stanislaus County; Brazelton

The appeal is dismissed. The petition for writ of mandate is denied on discretionary grounds. The request for judicial notice in case No.F030512 is denied. All orders previously issued by this court in this matter are hereby vacated.

F033552 People v. Muhammad

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

F032210 People v. Thomas

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

F034747 In re Brandon L., a Minor

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the calendar date heretofore set is vacated and the case is submitted for decision.

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F032497 People v. Ramos

Counsel having failed to request oral argument in the above-entitled case, oral argument is deemed waived in accordance with the provisions of a notice heretofore mailed to counsel and the cause is submitted.

F033266 People v. Leech

The trial court's finding that appellant lacked standing to object to the vehicle stop because she was a passenger in the vehicle is reversed; the matter is remanded for a ruling on the second-prong of the standing issue and a suppression hearing if standing is found.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]